

Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes

HL 107 3:30 – 5:00 pm

Date: January 19, 2010

Present Members: Laurie Burton, Kathy Farrell, Claire Ferraris, Kristina Frankenberger, Sriram Khe, Robert Monge, Jodie Raborn, Tracy Smiles, Amanda Smith, Tamina Toray, Steve Wojcikiewicz

Ex-Officio: Danielle Ambrose

1.0 Attendance and approval of minutes from 12/08/09
Minutes approved (Kristina Frankenberger abstained)

2.0 Chair's report

2.1 Approved directly by chair

2.1.1 MTH 403>403 (credit change)

2.1.2 MTH 404>404 (title, credit change)

2.1.3 MTH 409>409 (title, credit change)

Bookkeeping to help students / Registrar with transcripts

Announcements for Divisions

2.2 Please encourage faculty to use the rest of winter term and spring term to submit proposals. Although they will only be reflected in the Fall 2011 catalog, this might be a more convenient time to work on and process proposals.

3.0 Old Business: Course/program proposals

3.1 Health & Physical Education

3.1.1 New courses

3.1.2 Courses Revisions

3.1.2.1 PE 111-130, 132-199 (description) Action Approved
Approved with "per course" added to new course description

Discussion regarding DTE Program Change Proposals 3.3.2.1, 2 & 3

The discussion regarding the Division of Teacher Education program changes began with DTE Program Changes Proposals sponsor Mark Girod discussing revisions to the DTE proposal. Division representatives then expressing their thoughts and/or concerns over the proposals followed by responses from DTE Program Change Proposals sponsor Mark Girod.

Chair (NSM)

- Commented that DTE had prepared an addendum regarding the follow up to the 12/8/09 meeting where the committee had asked DTE to work with LAS divisions to resolve the conflicts. The addendum mentioned speaking to several divisions, but there was no discussion in the addendum regarding what happened and there were no changes recorded. Exception—Humanities and Linguistic courses and Geography.
- The Chair noted it was useful to see the impact statement on FTE for DTE
- The chair asked each division representative to address what had happened.

Psychology

- It is unclear what is motivating this change. DTE expressed in meeting with Psychology that the changes were not motivated by accreditation issues.
- The changes proposed by DTE create an insulating and isolating effect that moves away from important content areas and results in a loss of content areas
- The loss of content areas in the discipline can't be picked up and replicated with the program changes.
- There was follow up email from DTE after a psychology visit suggesting that Psychology and DTE could work together to teach and staff one ED Psych class, Psych 218. It was the suggestion of DTE that this would involve "joint-staffing" of the course but Psychology can not foresee how this could be managed, especially in the future. There was no suggestion by DTE to make any changes to the removal of the focus areas. Psychology Division was concerned about the specific loss of content by removing courses that involve Developmental Psychology. Psychology suggested that such a change would have a negative impact on teacher preparedness.

DTE Response

- The Elem/Middle program changes are not reducing focus areas but there are a limited number of credits available to meet challenges.

Health and Physical Education:

- The loss of PE 310 and HE 415 would eliminate any understanding of child motor development as well as physical and social development from those students the early childhood major. This is very important and a critical loss for these students.

DTE Response

- This represents a small population of those enrolled in the program.

Health and Physical Education:

- Yes, but these classes are still important for the small population of students.

Humanities

- The process is moving too fast. The communication classes in the program changes look like a picked group that may not represent the best choices for students whose career path includes public speaking.
- If approved as is, the program changes would diminish the relationship between Humanities and DTE.
- Humanities would like to be full partners in the process
- The program change discussions would work better if the whole process was slowed down and DTE could meet and work with each department in the affected areas.

DTE Response

- DTE did speak with Humanities representatives (but not every department) to address concerns. Mark asked why the Humanities CC rep did not return his phone call "last week."
- The changes represent a year and half of DTE work. If I have 100 decisions, 95 out of 100 are good. DTE feels the process is being caught up on the last 5 decisions. We can't make everyone 100% happy.

- DTE would like to move forward with this process and build relationships and make program adjustments as needed after the program is implemented.

Chair (NSM)

- Commented that in discussion via email / phone that Humanities and DTE had stated that the new Linguistic class for the DTE program (Ling 314) would be a prerequisite for the new Ed course: ED 374 Teaching Writing in the Elementary Classroom

DTE Response

- I don't recall but I am amenable to that change.

Social Science

The Soc. Sci. Division supports the Teacher Ed program change proposal, with the following observations:

- We recognize and respect that the Teacher Ed faculty know what is best for their curriculum. But, it would have been neat if we had been consulted with the revisions earlier in the process so that we could have provided constructive suggestions in a timely manner. For example, the possibility of more upper division courses, particularly for the Elem/Middle majors.
- We also understand that some of the concerns that we have relate more to the triggers from TSPC, NCLB, We want to continue with collaborating with our Teacher Ed colleagues, not only on fine-tuning the curriculum, but also on responding to these larger issues.

Business

- There is an overall feeling with these program changes of "too much, too fast."
- It is unclear as to why this needs to be done for the 2010 catalog.
- Would like to see impact statements regarding the program changes—what areas are being affected, how the changes will impact these areas, and why the proposed changes for these areas are being made. Would like to see an analysis of that includes documentation of discussion with other divisions, what was recommended by DTE and the other division, and an explanation of any division proposals that DTE chooses not to use.

Additional Discussion

- Steve Wojcikiewicz commented on the need for the new ED program to improve teacher preparation, and asked people to vote on the merits of the proposals themselves, rather than on the merits of the process by which the proposals were submitted.
- The Chair noted it would be useful to see an impact statement on FTE for DTE and other divisions

DTE Response

- DTE is trying to be good stewards to the curriculum with these changes.

Library

- Would like to know the impact to students who follow this program but are not admitted to the Teacher Education program.
- The process is moving too fast and would like to see more in depth discussions with each of the affected areas.

DTE Response

- DTE doesn't know the specific impact to students who are not accepted but feels that these issues can be addressed in advising.

Other Issues:

CC Chair

- In the interest of time, we need to move forward to motions regarding these proposals.

Motions

- A motion was called by Business to reject the DTE Program changes (seconded by Library)
- Chair started to say something and one DTE rep said the chair could only vote in the case of a tie break. As a result, the chair abstained from the vote.
- In further discussion, Tracey Smiles from DTE asked to have it put in the record that she felt the process for this proposal was unfair. Even though no other program changes have had this big of an impact, no other program change in the curriculum committee (last year and this year) has undergone such scrutiny.
- Also, she felt what is missing from the discussion is consideration for the children these future teachers would be teaching. Teacher Education has done a lot of hard work to get this into the catalog now. The objections to this are territorial in some way.

Motions

- To clarify what committee members were voting on (to rephrase the motion as positive so that yes means yes and no means no), the original motion was withdrawn.
- A new motion was called to accept the three DTE Program changes.

Discussion

- Further discussion included comments from each division following up their previous comments.
- The program sponsor said the program changes were critical for the education of the children in the state of Oregon.

(Chair asked the program sponsor to withhold comments during committee motion discussion)

- The program sponsor said if the program changes did not pass, this would damage the relationship between COE and LAS.

Voting YES

Teacher Education rep 1
Teacher Education rep 2
Social Sciences
Special Education

Voting NO

Psychology
Business
Creative Arts

Humanities

Library

Health and PE (this vote was registered as “yes reject” before the rep left the meeting)

Abstain

None

Vote Withheld

Natural Science and Math (chair) based on previous discussion

Voting Correction

The Health/Physical Education rep had to leave because the meeting had run over on time. They withdrew their vote (changed to abstain) as the motion had officially changed (from reject to approve) once they left the room.

Voting Final Count

Yes (4) No (5) Abstain (1) Vote Withheld (1)

The motion did not pass

Discussion regarding DTE Course proposals

- Assistant Registrar suggested that approving the courses would get them in the catalog and then, if the program changes were approved later in the spring, the program changes might be implemented. Discussion continued regarding print catalog for Fall 2010 vs. approved program changes not in the print catalog. The Assistant Registrar was asked to check about this with the Registrar.

Additional Discussion

- Steve Wojcikiewicz commented on the need for the new ED program to improve teacher preparation, and asked people to vote on the merits of the proposals themselves, rather than on the merits of the process by which the proposals were submitted.
- A motion to approve all courses under consideration (with discussed prereq changes) as a good faith effort so that DTE would know that their LAS colleagues were trying to work with them was made by the chair (NSM).

3.2 Teacher Education

Course approvals include prereq additions in DTE addendum and prereq addition of (new) Ling 314 for ED 374 (Tch Writ Elm Class)

3.2.1 New courses

3.2.1.1	ED 100 (Intro to Education)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.2	ED 270 (Tech in Education)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.3	ED 271 (Learning and Devel)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.4	ED 325 (Elem Science Methods)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.5	ED 370D (SpEd and Incl Comm)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.6	ED 373 (Int Curr and Assess)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.7	ED 374 (Tch Writ Elm Class)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.8	ED 404 (Std Teach Seminar I)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.1.9	ED 405 (Std Teach Seminar II)	Action <u>Approved</u>

3.2.2 Courses Revisions

3.2.2.1	ED 429 (title)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.2.2	ED 433 (title, number, description)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.2.3	ED 442 (title, number, description)	Action <u>Approved</u>

3.2.2.4	ED 444 (title)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.2.5	ED 452 (title, number, description)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.2.6	ED 453 (title, description)	Action <u>Approved</u>
3.2.2.7	ED 498 (title)	Action <u>Approved</u>

3.2.3 Program Changes

3.2.3.1	EC Only Education Major	Action <u>Not Approved</u>
3.2.3.2	EC/Elem Education Major	Action <u>Not Approved</u>
3.2.3.3	Elem/MS Education Major	Action <u>Not Approved</u>
3.2.3.4	Advising Plan for Pre-Ed	Action <u>Approved to move forward, not a curriculum proposal</u>

4.0 New Business: Course/program proposals

4.1 Humanities

4.1.1 New courses

4.1.1.1	LING410 (Theories of TEFL)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.1.1.2	LING415 (StratTEFLTeach)	Action <u>Approve</u>
	Approved with added LING 410 prereq	
4.1.1.3	LING416 (TEFL Cert)	Action <u>Approved</u>

4.1.2 Courses Revisions

4.1.2.1	LING492>LING492 (title, description, prereq)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.1.2.2	R201>R201 (description)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.1.2.3	R204>R204 (description)	Action <u>Approved</u>

4.2 Special Education

4.2.1 New courses

4.2.1.1	INT470 (Deaf-Blind Int)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.2.1.2	ASL805 (Professional Development)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.2.1.3	INT805 (Professional Development)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.2.1.4	RC805 (Professional Development)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.2.1.5	SPE805 (Professional Development)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.2.1.6	TPD805 (Professional Development)	Action <u>Approved</u>

4.3 Computer Science

4.3.1 New courses

4.3.2 Courses Revisions

4.3.2.1	CS 101 > CS 101 (prereq)	Action <u>Approved</u>
---------	--------------------------	------------------------

4.4 Social Science

4.4.1 New courses

4.4.1.1	CJ 444 (Restorative Justice)	Action <u>Approved</u>
	Approved with LACC Courses designation removed	

4.4.2 Courses Revisions

4.4.2.1	CJ 422 > CJ 422 (description)	Action <u>Approved</u>
4.4.2.2	CJ 425 > CJ 425 (description)	Action <u>Approved</u>

4.4.3 Drop courses

4.4.4 Program Changes

4.4.4.1	Fire Service Administration	Action <u>Approved</u>
---------	-----------------------------	------------------------

Laron Tolley presented the Program Changes for Fire Service Administration. The requested change was to drop the minor requirement from the Fire Service

Administration degree. 97% of students are off campus. The minor requirement forces students to go elsewhere to pick up classes to meet minor requirement.

The committee noted the following list of majors which don't require majors and discussed the interdisciplinary nature of these majors

- Math / CS double major
- All Teacher Ed majors
- All Bachelor of Music majors
- Interdisciplinary Studies

Both the chair and the Assistant Registrar expressed concern that dropping a minor from the FSA major did not reflect current practice and created a "slippery slope" precedent. The chair suggested that she would prefer to table the motion and bring it to her division for discussion.

The rest of the committee discussion focused in on the idea that because this is a specialized degree it would be appropriate to drop the minor.

5.0 Adjournment

Tuesday, January 12th, 2010

Memo: Minor modifications to Teacher Education curriculum proposals

At the December '09 Curriculum Committee meeting it was suggested that the Division of Teacher Education seek to more effectively partner with and receive input from divisions across campus regarding the proposals currently under review. Following this meeting an "all fac" email was posted from Dr. Laurie Burton, Chair of Curriculum Committee, asking that any division with outstanding concerns regarding these proposals to please contact Mark Girod from the Division of Teacher Education. Several divisions responded to this request including the divisions of Psychology, Health and Physical Education, and Social Sciences. In each case, faculty from Teacher Education met with and/or attended meetings with faculty in these areas to further discuss and collaborate on the proposals. After several productive conversations and meetings with Dr. David Hargreaves, a compromise was reached that is satisfactory to the English/Writing/Linguistics faculty. Finally, conversations between Teacher Education and Writing faculty yielded a revised set of WR classes to be included. In summary, the last month has been a very busy and productive time of collaboration and has yielded several small, but important revisions. Each is described below in a brief addendum to the original proposals.

Revisions:

1. For the EC Only degree plan, required Language Arts courses should be change:
FROM "Choose one: COM 323, COM 325, COM 342, LING 315, or WR 323"
TO "Choose one: COM 112, 321, 323, 325, 326, 342, 422, WR 321, 322, 323, 441, PHL 433, or LING 314"
2. For ECE and ELM degree plans under Humanities/Language Arts the courses should be changed:
FROM "Choose two: COM 323, COM 325, COM 342, LING 315, or WR 323"
TO "LING 314 and Choose one: COM 112, 321, 323, 325, 326, 342, 422, WR 321, 322, 323, 441, or PHL 433"
3. For all degree plans (EC only, ECE, and ELM) under required LACC classes the list should be expanded:
FROM "GEOG 105 or 107"
TO "GEOG 105, 106, or 107"
4. Through these collaborative conversations, Teacher Education faculty realized the need to identify pre-requisites for a few of the proposed courses. These pre-requisites include the following:
 - ED 342 Applied Children's Learning and Development ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 271 Learning and Development in the Classroom
 - ED 333 Applied Adolescent Learning and Development ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 271 Learning and Development in the Classroom
 - ED 312 Schools, Teachers, and Society ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 100 Intro to Education

- ED 352 Elementary Social Studies Methods ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 271 Learning and Development in the Classroom
- ED 374 Teaching Writing in the Elementary Classroom ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 271 Learning and Development in the Classroom
- ED 325 Elementary Science Methods ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 271 Learning and Development in the Classroom
- ED 230 Children's Literature ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 100 and 4 credits in ENG
- ED 240 Young Adult Literature ⇒ Prerequisite of ED 100 and 4 credits in ENG

Additional notes of clarification:

The Division of Teacher Education was asked to clarify the impact of proposed changes on focus areas for the ELM degree plan. No modifications are needed to focus areas because of the “no double dipping from major to focus area” rule that currently applies.

Next, it was requested that Teacher Education describe the fiscal implications of the proposals. In terms of FTE these proposals will likely increase needs from the 2009-2010 staffing model by the following:

'10-'11 academic year: 2.83 FTE (partial implementation of new curriculum)

'11-'12 academic year: 3.40 FTE (full implementation of new curriculum)

'12-'13 academic year and beyond: 2.40 FTE (reductions caused by reduced Education Core)

It is likely that these additions in FTE will be covered by long-term adjuncts until appropriate tenure-track faculty slots can be allocated and filled. Though we anticipate some increases in resources associated with field services we do not anticipate increased staff or room needs. However, careful planning to utilize rooms wisely will be necessary.

Finally, it has been asked why focus areas have been reduced in the Elementary/Middle degree plans. Focus areas at this level have been reduced to require students to become specialists in mathematics, science, social sciences (several focus areas), language arts, and Spanish. Again, it is our desire to increase preparation in core academic areas that are currently under intense testing pressure. Or, in the case of Spanish, to allow a clear pathway to bilingual teacher preparation which is also a high need area in Oregon.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this addendum and we hope it serves to clarify the proposals brought forward by the Division of Teacher Education.

Mark Girod
 Chair, Division of Teacher Education
 1/12/10